

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/462,695	01/12/2000	John B. Matthew	5411	
7	590 12/16/2004		EXAMINER	
Patrick J Walsh			SAVAGE, MATTHEW O	
400 Main Stree Stamford, CT			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
,			1724	
			DATE MAILED: 12/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	W
Advisory Action	09/462,695	MATTHEW ET AL.	•
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew O Savage	1724	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 29 November 2004 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application 1) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl ch places the applica	y to a Ition in
PERIOD FOR R	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	ng date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	of extension and the corresponding am of the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The apply originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ol>			
<ol><li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered to</li></ol>	pecause:		
(a) \( \square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claim	s.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	d be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	or reconsideration has been cons	idered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmer explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed:	•		
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>13-20</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9.☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	, - ,,		
		M Savoy Matthew O Savage Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1724	<b>.</b>

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment to the specification could not be entered since the portion of the specification to be amended (e.g., page number and paragraph number(s)) had not been included. The amendment would be entered if refiled specifying that all of the paragraphs of page 7 be replaced by the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment to claim 13 would be entered if filed in a separate amendment and would obviate the indefiniteness rejection concerning "approximately".